

BCC/GPD Talking Points

The City is confident that each case mentioned in the BCC report has been properly reviewed by inside and/or outside authorities.

- There has never been any evidence of malice, double standards, inequality, or investigatory abuse in any of the cases cited by the BCC in the report.
- The cases of alleged unfair treatment of employees were each misconduct cases that were vetted through employee chains of command and the chief of police, and all were appealed to the City Manager. In every case, the City Manager found the internal investigation sufficient to sustain serious allegations of misconduct and determined that employment termination was the appropriate course of action.
- Criminal cases were reviewed internally and by prosecuting authorities, grand juries, and also through courtroom proceedings. This document contains no new information that would alter the findings or outcomes of any of these incidents.

The GPD strives for the highest ethical and professional standards in how it polices the community and itself.

- Since 1986, GPD has met the rigorous standards of the Commission on Accreditation for Law Enforcement Agencies. In 2011, it received meritorious recognition in its reaccreditation assessment. Participation in this process is voluntary – less than 10% of departments in the US meet these high standards.
- Of the nearly 300,000 calls for service in 2011, 69 citizens filed complaints against GPD officers. PSD investigated all of them, and sustained 14 of those complaints.
- The GPD publishes its directives, conduct rules and disciplinary processes. It also publishes an annual report that describes all areas of employee investigations to inform the community and to help improve operations and performance, reduce risk, and improve public trust.

Recent survey results show that residents have a good impression of GPD's efforts.

- A resident survey conducted in 2011 by an independent market research firm indicates more than 75 percent of residents believe GPD officers perform their job courteously and professionally.
- More than 75 percent of residents believe that the GPD is doing a good job at making their neighborhoods safer.

Case Examples/Synopsis

The following are just three examples of facts, as reviewed and assembled by the Greensboro Police Department, that are not included in the BCC report. There are examples like these for every case included in the report and can be provided, as needed.

Lamonte Armstrong

Fact: Mr. Armstrong was one of several potential suspects identified at the time of the original investigation. His status as a suspect in the offense never changed throughout the investigation.

Fact: a partial palm print located at the scene was collected and sent to the State Crime Laboratory and no identification was made at that time.

Fact: Mr. Armstrong was convicted largely based on the testimony of his co-defendant and three additional witnesses that testified against Mr. Armstrong at trial.

Fact: The case was reviewed by the assigned Detective's supervisor. The case was then reviewed by the District Attorney's Office. The case was presented to a Grand Jury made up of citizens from the community. The case was presided over by a Judge and heard by a jury.

Duke University School of Law Wrongful Convictions Clinic:

The Greensboro Police Department and the District Attorney's Office were complimented by the Clinic for openness in the review of this case, by providing complete access to all case files and assigning an investigator to work with them. The Clinic described their interaction with the GPD and District Attorney's Office as a blueprint for how innocence reviews should be conducted.

Eva Foster

Fact: Ms. Foster was neither forced to the ground nor was there any evidence her wrist fractured in the incident. In her own words on December 7th, 2012, Ms. Foster described the officer's actions by stating that the officer was very nice, told her she needed to sit on the floor, that he assisted her to the floor, handcuffed her after she was seated on the floor, told her that he would be back very quickly after securing the remaining patrons, and he returned to remove the handcuffs. Ms. Foster further stated that she didn't like having the handcuffs applied, so between the time the officer handcuffed her and returned to remove them, she rolled around on the floor yelling for someone to remove the handcuffs.

Fact: Medical records do not establish that Ms. Foster was injured as a result of being placed in handcuffs and she did not complain of injury to officers or to assisting EMS personnel. Finally, there was no force used in securing Ms. Foster and she did not complain of force or excessive force being applied, so no investigation would have been required in the matter.

Joseph Pryor

Fact: In his response to Pryor's disciplinary appeal, City Manager Young communicated the investigation revealed that the African American arrestee specifically alleged that the officer who assaulted him was a black officer who was 6'0"-6'1" in height, dark complexion, with a close haircut. The only African American officer on scene was Officer Pryor.

Fact: A criminal investigation is standard protocol when there is an allegation that an officer assaulted an individual or used excessive force in effecting an arrest. Because of the description the arrestee provided, the only reasonable focus of the criminal investigation was Pryor.

Fact: Pryor alleged that another person forged or otherwise affixed his name to a Notice of Administrative Rights form used by Professional Standards. This resulted in a subsequent investigation and revealed that Pryor had lied about the signature. An outside certified document examiner confirmed the signature as belonging to Pryor. This resulted in a sustained allegation of untruthfulness and his employment termination by City Manager Young.